UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,051	06/29/2005	Philip Steven Newton	NL 021482	4083
	7590 07/01/200 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		NEWLIN, TIMOTHY R		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2424		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/541,051	NEWTON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	rimothy K. Newill	2424	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Arno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (IMONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🛛 Th <u>e proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</u>			cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		TE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•	al	
<ul><li>(c)   ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		octou olamno.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / monamone (	1 1 0 2 0 2 1 ).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii odbiiiitted iii a ooparate,	amery med ameriamer	it our looking the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	I sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	does NOT place the security of	annaliting for other	b
<ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the extraphed Information Displaceurs Statement(s).</li> </ul>		n condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	F 1 0/30/00/ Paper 190(8)		
/Christopher Kelley/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment seems to emphasize that the method relates specifically to storage rather than playback. However, the added language would not distinguish over OPENTV as stated on page 2 of the final rejection, which cites p. 5, II. 26-27 of OPENTV to meet the storage component. The amendment also adds the word "alternatively" to the last limitation. The alternative nature of the categories is implicit even without the recital of "alternatively," by virtue of the "or" stucture of the last limitation. The proposed addition of "alternatively" does not substantively change the scope of the claim and is therefore not entered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The request for reconsideration (dated 6/12/2009) merely repeats the arguments made by the applicant in the previous response (dated 1/12/2009). Those arguments were found unpersuasive (See final rejection dated 4/23/20090, pp. 2-3), and remain so. Therefore the arguments in the after final response do not place the application in better condition for allowance.